



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

LEGRAND'S *Étude sur Théocrite*, published in 1898 as the seventy-ninth fascicle of the *Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome*, might well have claimed an elaborate review at the time, but the limitations of the Journal as to space and otherwise have excluded the work from prompt consideration; and it is rather late in the day to call attention to a book that has already taken its place in the Theokritean apparatus of the scholarly world. The author calls it modestly a simple work of recapitulation. The *magnum opus* of Susemihl, whom, by the way, M. LEGRAND persistently calls Susemihl, has been drawn on for the bibliography, but, since the appearance of the *Geschichte der griechischen Litteratur in der Alexandrinerzeit*, our repository has been enriched by the discovery of the Mimes of Herondas, an event of prime importance, and by the emergence of the Erotic Fragment; and a number of special studies have been published which throw new light on the work and art of one who has been called the last of the classics; of whom Andrew Lang has said: "His lyre has all the chords: he is the last of all the perfect voices of Hellas; after him no man saw life with eyes so steady and so mirthful." By gathering up and registering the results of so much special inquiry, M. LEGRAND has rendered a real service, but, despite his modest disclaimer, he has done much more than this. He has not only summarized but analyzed, not only analyzed but criticized, and analysis and criticism are not all; and while he studiously avoids phrase-making, there are passages enough to show personal insight and fresh sympathy. It is not in vain that M. LEGRAND has followed a poet's advice and studied in the poet's own land, and the scholarly reserve of the *ancien membre de l'École française d'Athènes* melts when he recalls the brilliance of the Greek noonday and the rattle of the Greek tettix.

The first chapter deals with the work of Theokritos and questions of authorship. XIX (Κηριοκλέπτης), XX (Βουκολίσκος), XXI (Ἀλιεύς) and XXIII (Ἐραστής) are rejected—all with scant ceremony except the Ἀλιεύς, which he considers at greater length, out of deference to Birt's defence, who has seen in the poem the theme of the Ἐλπιδες, a poem attributed by Suidas to Theokritos. But, apart from Brinker's objections to the details of the composition, the philosophizing tendency of the piece is considered by M. LEGRAND as alien to the Theokritean character, and he strikes

the 'Αλλεῖς out of the list. Of the bucolic idylls proper he rejects IX entire. Of VIII he admits a few strophes as *débris* of a Theokritean original. XXV ('Ηρακλῆς λεοντοφόνος) is accepted 'after mature consideration,' and XXVII ('Οαριστύς), which is cited by no ancient authority and is separated in the MSS from the other mimes, is rejected by LEGRAND, as by the majority of scholars. There are, however, those who will agree with Andrew Lang that the piece is certainly worthy of a place beside the work of Theokritos. The third Aeolic piece, Οἶνος, ᾧ φίλε παῖ, λέγεται καὶ ἀλάθεια, is retained, and LEGRAND believed that Theokritos may have amused himself with inditing the Σῶριγξ, as such *carmina figurata* were in the taste of the time, and we are not to look for supreme poetry in such trifles.

The second chapter deals with an examination of the biographical documents, the fixed *point de repère* being Id. XVI (Χάριτες ἢ 'Ιέρων), which M. LEGRAND places between the summer of 275 and the early months of 274. Theokritos, a Syracusan, according to prevalent testimony, was one of the first to hail the rising sun of Hieron's glory. Where had he been before? At the court of the Lagidae? Not one of the Ptolemaic poems precedes XVI. On the island of Kos? A seductive theory; but, according to LEGRAND, all the allusions to Kos and things Koan may be referred to a later period of the poet's life. Id. XVI belongs to the young manhood of Theokritos, and the failure of his suit to Hieron resulted in his leaving, say in 273, his ungrateful country, to which he never returned, so that almost all the idylls were written in the East. While engaged in establishing this theory, M. LEGRAND passes in review the relations of Theokritos to Philetas, Asklepiades, Aratos, and others, and then proceeds to discuss in a separate section the supposed allusions to the great quarrel between Kallimachos and Apollonios, which he declines to accept. He does not believe that Theokritos made it his business to better the work of his younger contemporary, and thus show his superiority to the ambitious author of the Argonautica, whom Kallimachos had pilloried as an unclean and rapacious bird.

The third chapter—*L'invention des motifs*—gives a long inventory which it is impossible to summarize, and I must content myself with indicating the characteristic results of the study. Theokritos is not an innovator: he assimilates rather than creates. He does not pose as a savant, an historian, a mythographer. His object is, frankly, to please (*delectare*), not to instruct (*prodesse*). He does attempt to individualize. He deals with the types of his time. His strong side is not ingenuity, not industry. His object is to produce dramatic emotion under the most common forms.

So far from aiming at variety, his rustic scenes—those on which his reputation rests—are often very like one another. The world in which he moves is narrow, and the source of the interest which he inspires comes from his variety of expression, and it is with the expression that the fourth chapter deals, with the dialect, the versification, and the style. Here again I must content myself with the author's summary. For an Alexandrian there is in Theokritos a remarkable absence of the caprice of the pedant, the ostentation of the *virtuoso*. There are few rare words, few manufactured words. There is no minute mimicry in vocabulary and dialect. Noteworthy is his independence over against those metrical rules that increase the difficulty without enhancing the charm of the verse. There is no restless striving after novelty in figures and other details of style; no *imitandi cacoethes*. Even the symmetry, which is so striking a feature, corresponds to the actual conditions of the life that furnishes the prototype of the bucolic poems. All this makes Theokritos, for the time in which he lived, a relatively simple author. His weaknesses lie in what M. LEGRAND calls the material elements of expression. His grammar is faulty; his vocabulary lacks the cardinal virtue of *proprietas*; his dialects are a mixture. 'Le style, chez Théocrite,' says M. LEGRAND, 'vaut mieux que la langue'—as if the two could be disengaged.

That every side of this complex subject should be treated with equal mastery was hardly to be expected, and the handling of the syntax is not all that could be desired. To cite but one instance: the exhibition of the article is dependent on an old monograph by Ameis, which dates from the year 1846, before the modern statistical method had been introduced, and whatever the defects of that method may be, it has served to reduce the margin of rash assertion and to bring out masses of suggestive facts. The article in Theokritos is now under Epic, now under Doric influence, and a distinctly different use is to be expected in the different classes of Theokritean poetry, just as Kunst has shown (A. J. P. VIII 116) that the structure of the hexameter in the epic idylls differs from that of the bucolic idylls. To the general principle of variation, M. LEGRAND himself does homage, but personal study of the subject would hardly have omitted the curious illustration that is furnished by Id. XIII ("γλας), in which the introductory verses (1-15) addressed to Nikias are replete with articles. When the epyllion begins, the article retreats.

When I began this notice, I thought of making M. LEGRAND'S book the foundation of a little essay, on 'Impression and Analysis,' but that little essay would, after all, have been only another ver-

sion of the old sermon that I have been preaching these many years, and I spare the readers of the Journal an unnecessary reinforcement of the doctrine that minute study is not inevitably fatal to the highest enjoyment. What the impressionist critic sees and feels, the analytical critic records by his instruments of precision. The new shudder of which Victor Hugo speaks is no less a new shudder because there is a thermometer to mark the degree of cold. But there is danger in the process, as may be seen when one compares M. LEGRAND'S estimate of Theokritos with that of Andrew Lang, already cited, and it must be confessed that the patient assemblage of details has left the marks of fatigue on the last pages of this valuable monograph. The estimate may be just, but the breath of enthusiasm has spent itself, and one notes a certain autumnal disillusionment.

The completion of the *Dictionnaire général de la langue française du commencement du XVII^e siècle jusqu'à nos jours* (Paris, Delagrave) will be hailed with delight by all scholars. Thirty years of work have found their happy termination, and the thirty-two fascicles have been bound in two volumes and are to be had for the extremely reasonable price of 38 francs. The end of the dictionary proper was reached in the twenty-ninth fascicle, but the close of the twenty-ninth and the subsequent three fascicles have been given up to a treatise on the formation of the French language left unfinished by the death of the lamented Arsène Darmesteter and now completed by M. Léopold Sudre. It is a treatise, but much more than a treatise. It is a general theory of the French language, of which the dictionary is an application and to which constant reference is made in the body of the work. The value and importance of this feature of the dictionary has been recognized by the Académie des sciences morales et politiques, which has adjudged it the Grand Prix Jean Reynaud of 1000 francs.

According to PRELLWITZ in the *Festschrift für L. Friedländer*, ἔτος is 'year,' ἐνιαυτός (from ἐνι αὐτῷ) is 'anniversary.' This view, which met with wide acceptance, was confirmed by the observations of Türk (A. J. P. XVIII 367) and Wilhelm (A. J. P. XIX 228). In vol. CXLII of the *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Ak. in Wien*, Professor WILHELM has resumed the study of the inscriptional and other evidence. While the two words are interchangeable in a number of phrases—e. g. κατ' ἔτος, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, δι' ἔτους, δι' ἐνιαυτοῦ—they part company at a certain point. The ISS have ἐφ' ἔτος, καθ' ἔτος in the sense of 'this year,' never ἐπ' ἐνιαυτόν, κατ' ἐνιαυτόν. He is therefore inclined to define ἐνιαυτός as a definite period of time, a calendar year, an official year; but invites further investigation of the interesting problem.

The preparation of a good index is always praiseworthy work, and secures for the compiler a permanent place in the apparatus of scholars as well as the thanks of all special students. The *Index in Xenophontis Memorabilia*, for which KATHARINE MARY GLOTH and MARY FRANCIS KELLOGG are responsible, and which forms No. XI of the *Cornell Studies in Classical Philology* (New York, The Macmillan Co.), was prepared under the guidance of Dr. FORMAN, himself the author of an excellent index to Andokides, Deinarchos, and Lykurgos, and his scrutiny is a warrant of good work, so that I am willing to trust it until some one of my contributors finds time for a series of severe tests. Cf. A. J. P. XVII 224-9. To the scholar accustomed to the close observation of phenomena the reading of such an index is full of suggestions (A. J. P. XVI 525); and the comparison of the statistics to be gathered from GLOTH and KELLOGG with JOOST on the *Anabasis* (A. J. P. XIV 101-6) would furnish food for thought, perhaps fodder for a doctoral dissertation—a consummation devoutly wished by many impatient students. Unfortunately, one of the most interesting of these subjects has been preoccupied. See the literature cited by F. WESTPHAL in his *Praepositionen bei Xenophon*, a Freienwalde Programme of 1888. *ἀνά* does not occur at all. *ἀμφί* but once (I 1, 18), in the phrase *τοὺς ἀμφί*. In the *Memorabilia* *πρός* overrides *εἰς*, a fact doubtless due to the personal sphere of the work, which has to do largely with ethical questions. In striking contrast to Xenophon's general usage, as given by Mommsen, *μετά* c. gen. occurs in the *Memorabilia* oftener than *σύν* with the dative. But SIMON, in his *Xenophon-Studien* (IV 6), allows no weight to this on account of the small number of both *μετά* and *σύν* in the *Anabasis*, whereas he deems it significant that in the 'third part' of the *Hellenica* *σύν* gives way to *μετά*. According to him, the development of Xenophon's style lies in the closer approximation to pure Attic usage. That *μετά* and *σύν* together have relatively so little scope in the *Memorabilia* seems to be due to the sphere or, if one chooses, to the 'Stilgattung.' 'Jedenfalls,' says JOOST, under the head of the final sentence (p. 222), 'ist die Stilgattung nicht ohne Bedeutung; der Sprachgebrauch in den *Memorabilien* berührt sich mit demjenigen *Platos*.' But how cautious one must be in manipulating the figures I have shown in the footnote to A. J. P. VIII 221 (note).

The last issue of the Journal was the vacation number, and that may possibly account for the mortifying frequency of *Errata* in the last *Brief Mention*. They are all easily set right, but the Editor finds a certain solace in correcting *ῥποι* (p. 233, l. 13 from top) into *εῖποι* and *ῥδομαι* (ibid., l. 5 from bottom) into *ῥδομαι*.